

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XX

JULY, 1927

NUMBER 3

THE STRUCTURE AND LITERARY CHARACTER OF THE GOSPELS

MARTIN DIBELIUS

UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG

THE gospels are alike evidences for our faith and documents of a crisis in human history. They claim not only the interest of believers but also the most serious attention of the historical inquirer. No wonder, then, that the methods employed to throw light upon them show an ever increasing refinement, and that in the course of time every canon of criticism which can be utilized in the interpretation of ancient texts has come to be applied to the gospels. In dealing with the problem of the gospels we have to do something more than explain them bit by bit; we have also to answer the question how they came to exist at all. We must know something about that, before we can decide how far the evangelist wrote history — or intended to write history. To us it seems a matter of course that the followers of Jesus should write the story of his life: but for the first Christians this was by no means a matter of course. They lived in expectation of the end of the world; and therefore they did not need to leave any written records for posterity. For the most part they came from a stratum of society which did not write books; very few of them had the inclination or the capacity for literary work. Further, it was their desire to renounce the world; what had they then to do with the worldly calling of the writer?

Bearing such considerations as these in mind, we cannot be surprised to find that the first Christians were unliterary, and that, as a result of this, non-christian writers were silent about Jesus or spoke of him only by hearsay. On the contrary, it becomes astonishing in the extreme that we possess any Chris-

tian accounts whatever of the life of Jesus. It need not puzzle us that the question has again and again been raised whether these accounts are not just the literature of a cultus, a series of myths or legends devoid of all historical value. And even if this could not be established, the attempt was made to show that the historical character of the records is at best extremely dubious. Nineteenth-century criticism attacked with vigor at this point, and was as acute in its scepticism as anyone could wish it to be. But it also made two observations which point in a different direction. In the first place, it established the probability that the gospels did not originate in the first thirty years after the death of Jesus, but later. In the second, it showed that other texts were in existence before the gospels — little books, sources, outlines, or the like — and that out of these our gospels were put together.

This study of the sources has established certain widely recognized results, as for instance what is called the Two-source theory. These inferences are the result of an enormous labor of investigation on the part of their discoverers. And if I now express the belief that the further investigation of the origins of our gospels requires us to follow other paths, I should not wish to seem ungrateful to the men to whom we are indebted for the theories I have mentioned, nor ungrateful, indeed, for the most recent attempts to advance along the road of 'Quellenkritik,' and to discover sources as yet unrecognized. Such attempts, it may be, will throw further light upon the working methods of the evangelists and their predecessors, and therefore upon the evolution of the gospels, so far as that process consisted in the production of books. But at this point other considerations must come in, namely those which in Germany have led us to the study of literary form, the method of 'Formgeschichte.'

At the very beginning of Christian history there were no Christian descriptions of the life of Jesus. What was there then? And what do our gospels reveal to us about what existed then?

I

Our gospels themselves indicate that their evolution did not take place in the sphere of literature, strictly so called. They do not fall under any of the known categories of Greek contemporary literature. Justin indeed calls them ἀπομνημονεύματα, but the name is an apologetic one; he does not intend to give the Christian writings a place in a scientific classification, but to say to his pagan readers: 'The gospels are to us what ἀπομνημονεύματα, or memoirs, are to you.' He means only to give his readers an idea of the position assigned by Christians to their gospels. The gospels exhibit a type which has parallels wherever the traditions of a people or a group are collected in book form. Such traditions circulated first either orally or as written outlines, records of discourses, and the like, but not in the form of published and marketable books. Such may have been the case with the earliest tales of monastic life — the earlier stages of the extant collections — or with the original traditions of St. Francis, the stories of the Jewish Hasidim in Poland, and the German stories of Doctor Faustus.¹

From Hellas we can adduce certain anecdotes of popular philosophers, which came to be incorporated in the literary biographies that still survive. Popular narratives of miracles attributed to a god, such as were circulated notably in the cult of Serapis, must also be noticed. Not that a direct connection existed between these stories and our gospels, but that here and there the laws determining their emergence in a definite shape, and at times also the mode of their dissemination, show a certain resemblance.

The familiar and admitted fact that the gospels represent collections of traditional matter is thus brought into a new light. The most important work that has to be done before we can begin to speak of historical criticism is the separation between tradition and composition, between the work of the evangelist and the material handed down to him. In view of

¹ I have borrowed these examples from an essay by Karl Ludwig Schmidt, 'Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte,' in *Εὐχαριστήριον* for Hermann Gunkel, II, pp. 50 ff., Göttingen, 1923.

this problem the Fourth Gospel clearly occupies a somewhat special place. For the Fourth Evangelist, whoever he may have been, considered it his task to render what he knew, or what he had received, lucid and luminous, and so to set down not merely an historical account, but an interpretation, of his Master's story. In the Gospel of John, therefore, the influence of the writer's personality must be regarded as specially potent. Here we have a real personal achievement, though not what contemporary literature would have judged as such; while the earliest of our evangelists, Mark, had indeed his own conception of his material.

The texts themselves supply the proof of what I have just said. In the Gospel of John it is very seldom that clearly-outlined, independent pieces are discernible, such as — on the analogy of other popular traditions — we should expect to find as elements in the oldest pre-literary tradition. In Mark, on the other hand, every reader must notice how independent the pericopae are, and how clearly each is marked off from what precedes and what follows it; little stories, short parables, and groups of sayings form the content of this book. What are called the 'seams,' the points of junction between one pericope and the next, are still easily detected for the most part, nor is it hard to see where the writer has appended a remark of his own, and where he has interpolated passages of transition. The conflicts in which, according to Mark 2, 1-3, 6, Jesus engaged were not originally related to the churches as one undivided tale, but were circulated piecemeal; in Mark they are narrated consecutively, as belonging all to the same subject, but are only loosely connected; Luke was the first to work them into a real unity.

The two evangelists not mentioned as yet, Matthew and Luke, occupy a middle position, Matthew standing nearer to Mark, and Luke to John; for among the Synoptists Luke is the one who works most as a literary craftsman would do. He forges links of connection; at the end of the section on the Baptist he briefly relates his arrest; at the end of the Temptation he prepares the reader to learn that the devil has only postponed his plan, and will soon take it up again with the

help of the traitor Judas; he introduces in Galilee, at the apt moment, the women who later will stand beneath the Cross; he tells of Herod's wish to see Jesus, and of its fulfilment in the passion-story. Certainly Luke deals cautiously with his material—it has already acquired a certain fixity as tradition; how he writes when his hands are more free, and he has to lay down the lines of his own work we can see clearly in Acts. But in the gospel he of course adheres closely to the outline of Mark; here he is much more of a traditionalist than in the second part of his work.

Matthew is much less of a literary man than Luke; he reveals this in his choice of words, in the structure of his sentences, in the simplicity of his style. But it is easy to see, from his propensity to quote from the Old Testament, to tone down Mark's realistic touches, to arrange narratives and sayings according to their subjects, that his peculiarities closely reflect the requirements of the churches. When the Matthaean alterations of Mark are regarded from this point of view, it is not in all cases easy to say whether they come from Matthew or were found by him in existing church usage. At the Last Supper, where he makes Jesus say 'take, eat,' instead of 'take,' as in Mark, and adds to the clause concerning the cup, 'for the forgiveness of sins,' this is perhaps to be referred to the influence of church worship, rather than taken as a literary alteration. Only with caution, therefore, are we entitled to speak of the literary personality of Matthew. Matthew and Luke, however, have this in common as against Mark, that they adopt the tradition of the words of Jesus, to which Mark devoted but little attention. It has long been recognized that in this they follow a common source. But to me it seems that this difference between Matthew and Luke on the one side and Mark on the other points to a difference of background; clearly the collection of the words of Jesus and that of the narratives about him were formed from two differing points of view. It is Mark, in the first instance, who suggests this conclusion; he appears to be acquainted with the tradition of the words of Jesus, since he draws upon it here and there, but only quotes what throws light upon his narrative. He attaches no

importance to completeness; on the contrary, in chapters iv and xii one gets the impression that he quotes only an excerpt from the tradition; for he uses the phrase, 'Jesus said in his teaching,' and refers to the existence of other parables which he does not record. Clearly, then, in Mark's time there was a tradition of the words of Jesus; it is known to him, but is disregarded because it is his purpose to depict the secret messiahship of Jesus, the hardening of the people's heart, and the outbreak of the conflict.

Now this result is borne out by the actual aspect of the tradition; and with this the inquiry into what we Germans call *Formgeschichte* is concerned.

II

This method, as distinguished from others, uses style, or the 'form' in which the traditional materials are presented, as its criterion. We attempt to infer from the characteristics of the style the conditions in which, and the purpose for which, any given section was put into shape. Let me make this clear by an example. In the narrative in which Jesus foretells Peter's denial the ordinary word *φωνεῖν* is used for the crowing of the cock, a word which otherwise means 'call.' The Fayyum fragment in which the same section of the passion-narrative is preserved uses instead the popular, onomatopoetic word which in its original use is the call of the cuckoo, *κοκκῶζειν*. If we are to take this mode of expression as the older — which involves, of course, no decision as to the date of the actual fragment — then we should have to say that the expression found in the gospel-text originated from the liturgical need for dignity of speech. If, on the other hand, the Fayyum text is the later, the stylistic change which it makes would indicate the wish to transpose the tradition into the mode of secular story-telling, which made use of picturesqueness in style.

Now the same criterion, criticism of style, can be applied to the tradition of the words of Jesus. If in the Sermon on the Mount they are recorded without details of circumstance, saying after saying, rule after rule, this points to a tradition which

had no interest in the circumstances in which a word was spoken; it must have been concerned only with its content, and with its more than occasional significance. Clearly, then, collections of words of Jesus were once extant in which the sayings were arranged in a series, with no narrative, and linked together either by their subject-matter or by mnemonic devices. If the Oxyrhynchus papyri still contain such sayings without information as to their occasion, sayings having as their characteristic introduction 'Jesus says' (not, 'said'), such late collections reveal the existence of a need similar to that to which the earliest series of words of Jesus owe their formation — the need of regulating one's own life according to the Master's words. These sayings were preserved as rules for the life of the individual and of the church. It is characteristic, however, that the only words of Jesus, apart from the eucharistic narrative, which are directly quoted by Paul, do not concern matters of faith, but questions of church and family life — divorce and the maintenance of missionaries. In a collection of this kind it is not, indeed, remembered that Jesus' words indicate and imply a new attitude of man towards God; but perhaps just that scrupulousness, to which the estimation of Jesus' teachings *as law* must have led, may have helped to preserve their wording, and may have helped more than a creative impulse drawn from the spirit of the gospel would have done. Thus the inquiry into the form in which the words of Jesus were handed down gives us a view of the significance which the first pre-canonical collections of these sayings must have had. And at the same time we understand the attitude of Mark to this tradition; intending, as he does, to focus his narrative upon the conflicts of Jesus, he has no motive for incorporating this tradition as a whole into his book; he knows it, and uses it where he finds it useful, but does not include it, as a whole, in his gospel.

If we now turn our inquiry to the tradition of which Mark made primary use in his work, we are confronted with a second problem — the question as to the form of the oldest *narratives* of Jesus. At the first glance, the tradition presents a manifold appearance; stories long and short, stories rich in picturesque

features and others which are scant of description, stories centring about a miracle or about a saying; stories conveying a direct point of edification which no reader could miss and others in which the simply edifying words are put into the background by the amazingness, the striking character, the element of power in the figure of Jesus. Still, among this wealth of variety, certain special types can easily be discerned.

First, some narratives are closely related to the tradition of the words of Jesus, being indeed simply sayings framed in a setting of narrative. The saying, "Blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it" (Lk. 11, 28) is the answer to "blessed is the womb that bare thee"; this antithesis is not insignificant but serves to give deeper meaning to the saying. Thus in this case the recording of the utterance which gives rise to the saying is not unessential — we might speak of the whole as a brief narrative.

From the mass of other narratives two diverse types can be singled out: one in which the scale is large and the emphasis lies upon the description of the situation, of the miracle, of its positive effect, and another of greater brevity in which the descriptive element is quite subordinate, or at least secondary. We can best form an idea of these types by reading, one after the other, the stories of the healings of demoniacs in the first and fifth chapters of Mark. The detailed description of the disease in Mark v, and also the familiar picture which follows of the end of the demon-ridden swine in the lake — these are the things which stay in the memory of the reader of this story. In the former narrative, on the other hand, the central point is the effect of Jesus' appearance in the synagogue at Capernaum; the 'authority' of which his teaching gives proof is proved also in his contact with the unclean spirit; and the impression made upon those present by the healing shows itself, conversely, in respect for the new teaching which is conjoined with such authority.

We must not be misled by the external fact of the relative length of the stories; the story of the man with the withered hand healed on the Sabbath, is to be grouped, in spite of its length, with the narratives in which the emphasis does not fall upon

the descriptive element. How differently told, and how much more detailed in the account of the healing, are the two miracles in Mark vii of the deaf and dumb man and of the blind man of Bethsaida! They occupy indeed about the same total space as the first narrative, but they are so stressed throughout as to reproduce the occurrences vividly; they enumerate the means used — the healing spittle, the healing hands, the healing word, and they describe the sufferers' recovery.

Naturally there are examples of narratives intermediate between the two types, such as the story of the leper; but nevertheless the distinction holds good; for it is probable that the detailed type developed out of the shorter, and that consequently some narratives are preserved which occupy a middle place between the two.

In employing this criterion of style I am not concerned with aesthetic judgments but with the discernment of the process which led to the differing modes of formulation. In the interpretation of those differences a comparison with other literatures is fruitful. Anyone acquainted with the miracle-stories of Hellenism knows that the detailed style of narration, in which technical particulars of the miracle are given, is normal in that sphere. The tales of Asklepios at Epidauros, of Apollonius of Tyana, and of other wonder-workers were told in that way. The style is secular, even if the matter is religious. It gives expression to a delight in miracle for its own sake, as well as in the depiction of striking, amazing, exalted scenes. Tales of healing are accompanied by accounts of vain attempts by other physicians using other prescriptions; tales of deliverance are heightened by description of the dangers involved, designed to satisfy pious curiosity as well as the appetite for edification. The story must end by placing the complete success of the miracle beyond all doubt. The bible-reader is surprised, on reaching the end of the lofty narrative of Jairus' daughter, to find, instead of a solemn conclusion, the words "he said that something should be given her to eat." The surprise vanishes when it is observed that this sentence conveys the assurance of the permanence of the cure; the girl was raised to actual, and not merely apparent, life, since she began to take

food like an ordinary human being. The apparently prosaic detail has a special emotional value.

The case is quite different with that shorter type of tale from the life of Jesus of which the blessing of children, the healing of the withered hand, the narratives of the rich man and of the kinsfolk of Jesus are examples. In this class also we have wonder-stories, but the miracle is not central; it points to something beyond itself, such as the authority of Jesus over the Sabbath or his power to forgive sins. There is always a deeper meaning behind the miracle, causing it to rank with the words and decisive sayings of Jesus; always an emphasis upon the thought that in the person of Jesus the life beyond is revealed. Everything, then, that a skilful narrator might relate about the occurrences is naturally repressed; there are no personal touches, no depictions of the scene, unless, as in the case of the paralytic, these are called for by the special purpose of the tale. Where did the blessing of the children take place? Painters have represented it in many ways, and the brief gospel story gives them a free hand. Who was the rich man that came to Jesus? The two other Synoptists, Matthew and Luke, give different answers; the one makes him a young man, the other a ruler; but this freedom is only possible because the earliest evangelist — that is, the tradition followed by him — had no interest in the point. Who was the woman with the ointment at Bethany? Later writers thought they knew; but Mark and even Matthew do not disclose the name. One feels at once the completeness of the contrast between this mode of telling a tale and that which we find in the romances and even in the miracle-romances of antiquity; but it contrasts also with the motives of later legends, which are eager to know the names, the personal experiences, and as much else as possible, of those whose stories they relate. Restraint in description, concentration upon points of importance for faith and for church life, are indications of a definite style or manner — perhaps we may best call it the style of edification. There can be no doubt that in these narratives the primary purpose is related to the needs of faith and practical religion, while color, vividness, and realism are quite secondary objects.

We may go on to say that the shorter narratives are more typically Christian than those more detailed ones which have their counterpart in secular literature; and that, since the history of early Christianity is, in a general way, the history of its domestication in the world, we may regard the more secular type, quâ type, as the later of the two. The question then arises, how, if the shorter type is the older, shall we explain to ourselves its origin within the Christian circle, and how are we to make it probable that unworldly and unliterary men created a narrative style.

In my belief there is a very simple answer to this question, an answer which is all the easier to find because it is the solution of a problem presented by the earliest Christian literature as a whole — the problem of how Christians came to write books at all seeing that the conditions which would lead them to do so were all lacking. How did it come about that the Apostle Paul, instead of sending to his congregations brief notes not worth a second reading, wrote them letters which quite soon and quite rightly were treated as books. In the case of Paul the answer is simple: his letters became books, not because he was an author to start with, but because in his letters he preaches, that is, he does from a distance just what he would do if he were in the presence of his congregation. And that is the answer, too, to the question relating to the gospels; Christians composed narratives about Jesus, not for the benefit of posterity, and not for the sake of indulging in reminiscence, but because for preaching, and especially for mission-preaching, such narratives were indispensable. This must of course have its parallel in the history of popular traditions: the life-stories of popular philosophers and holy men were often propagated by telling a series of anecdotes about them; and even in our day the really popular figures of history survive among the masses, not through documents, chronicles, and books of history, but through those tales which we call anecdotes, and which are full of characteristic touches.

And now a phenomenon discloses itself which, as I think, substantiates what I have said hitherto. The special character of the shorter type of narrative in the gospels is best explained

when we see in it the type which was created to meet the needs of preaching, and employed by preachers. Preaching requires short anecdotes which do not stop to dwell on side-issues, do not wander off into description, and say very little about secondary characters; it needs narratives which speak of that which the preaching attests — of the divine power of Jesus, of his words, his acts, his person. Those stories which Christian missionaries took about with them in their scrip (πίρα), written perhaps on sheets of papyrus, must have looked very much like the stories of the shorter and older type in Mark. We may infer this, I think, with a considerable degree of certainty. But if so, another probability follows, that the formulation of these stories in Mark is connected with the preaching activity of the first Christian communities. I have therefore used for them the name 'paradigma,' or 'illustrative tale.'² Bultmann's suggestion to substitute for this the word 'apophthegma'³ is based on the view that these sections, so far as they contain words and not miracles of Jesus, were in essence sayings put into a setting, a setting which in itself had no significance.

I think, however, that we must make a distinction between sayings and stories, in so far as the setting of the stories is to any degree essential for the understanding of the whole. The question whether the setting is original, like the question of historicity in general, must be kept clear from the investigation of form; otherwise the argument from the criterion of style will lose its precision. The historical question is a subsequent one, and must be considered in its own context.

The other stories, with their more brightly colored style and their interest in the technique of miracle, point back to different needs of the community from the paradigmata. We find ourselves, first, in the presence of narrators who have learned something of the way in which other stories of wonder-workers were in those days habitually told. They are thus acquainted with a certain art of narration, a popular and primitive art, but one which shows a preference for good and skilful storytelling. To this kind of colored and minutely detailed narrative

² Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, p. 74.

³ Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, p. 4.

I give the name 'novelle,' a term intended to suggest a kinship with the current methods of secular narrative, in fact the 'ancient novel'; but without thereby prejudging the historical character of this type, any more than its Christian character. Certainly one can only think of these 'novellen' as originating in communities whose members were no longer preoccupied with the coming end. Yet we need not think of highly educated communities; the eastern story-teller is often a man of the village; when I speak of worldly interests in connection with the novellen, I do not mean artistic training or anything of that sort, but merely an interest in strong colors and concrete detail.

One more question emerges: In what language were these narratives put into shape? One might suppose this to have been done in the language of Jesus, in Aramaic, and that the evangelists translated the sections in order to put them into their Greek setting. But this, I think, is not the most probable view. If the paradigmata arose out of the work of mission-preaching, it is to be assumed that they were at least given their shape in the language of the mission, that is to say, in Greek. Naturally, all genuine words of Jesus had to be so translated, but this came about, not through a systematic scheme of translation, but through the process of transference which bilingual people carry on almost without knowing it. Someone hears one day a word of Jesus from a member of the community at Jerusalem; the next day he tells it to a circle of gentile hearers, probably in Greek. We are justified in picturing the circumstances of the mission-field in this way, for according to Acts, which is supported to a certain extent by the testimony of Paul, mission-work was done with special success from Syria as a centre; but Antioch was always a bilingual city, and so was Damascus, where Paul became a Christian. Likewise the tradition of the words of Jesus points to missionary activity. If they were collected, as I have said, in order to provide rules of living, the needs of the new members of Christian communities will not have been forgotten. We know from Paul that it was his custom to hand on to his mission-churches rules for daily life, and the words of the Lord which he quotes

are part of what he handed on in this way. We may assume, then, that the same kind of thing was done in other communities besides those which had Paul as their missionary. But then we must also take it as certain that in the processes of formulation the language used was that of the mission. This question is in fact one of the great historical problems with which the development of Christianity confronts us: why did the development move with such strength towards the West? Why was the Eastern side of the mission — though we must not underestimate its importance — relatively weaker from the first? To answer this question would be to give at least a partial solution of the problem of Hellenism, in which the question of language and that of culture react upon each other. Our question is a more limited one, and I need only make one point clear: missions in which Aramaic was used impressed a permanent form upon so little of the tradition that when, in the second century, an Aramaic gospel was wanted, a translation of Matthew was made, in an expanded form; for that, and nothing more, the Gospel of the Nazarenes (which Jerome used) appears to have been. If the churches had possessed a copious store of Aramaic tradition from the beginning, and that tradition had really assumed a definite form — preservation, remember, depends on formulation — it would not have been necessary to have recourse to a Greek gospel.

III

Having clarified our thought as to the conditions under which the tradition about Jesus could come into being, we may now pass to the consideration of its historical value. This question is burdened with the difficulty that the modern man has a special and peculiarly modern notion of historical value. To him the most reliable evidence is that of an affidavit, the duly attested deposition of an eyewitness. He is often somewhat blind to the possibilities of error to which even an affidavit is liable. We may venture to say that the popular mind is rather less prone to think in terms of legal documents. In reproducing a story it inserts interpretative touches, for vivid-

ness' sake — I mean, it gives play to imagination. And the feeling of antiquity was entirely different from ours. Ancient historians made the characters of their narrative give expression to the kind of view that they might have held, even when there was no trace of evidence that they did so speak. There was no hesitation in transforming narrative into quotation. Mark's narrative of the Last Supper says, "and they all drank of it"; this appears in Matthew as "drink ye all of it." And both evangelists reproduce in virtually identical language the decision of the sanhedrin against arresting Jesus during the feast, although they can hardly have had any oral or written evidence of a decision so secret. Lastly, in the specific case of religious tradition an interpretative mode of narration is *de rigueur* in antiquity, since the transmission of the story has a definite purpose — let us call it the purpose of edification — which a narrative devoid of interpretation could not achieve. No account of the events on Calvary could do what it was meant to do for early Christianity, unless the narrative carried with it the impression that all this tale of terror and humiliation was a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, and thus — to sum up in a word the primary religious significance of this proof from prediction — that it came to pass in accordance with the will of God.

We must not, then, try to discuss the historical character of the gospel narratives until we have made it clear to ourselves that in the narrators we have to do with men whose feeling was that of the people, with men of the ancient world, and, thirdly, with men who had a religious purpose in telling their tale. These three conditions have the effect of limiting the notion of 'historical character' as modern men use it. Even in the most favorable light, the narratives which we have before us are the product of a *style*, and that style is of a popular, ancient, and religious character.

Presupposing this, let us follow the problem of historical character a little further. We saw that the narratives which I call *paradigmata* show as yet but little of the influence of secular narrative methods. They point to a situation in which Christianity has still no close relation to the world. In the

same way we can discern how in the tradition of the sayings the habit of reference to worldly relationships comes in gradually, and leads to certain modifications of their originally radical character. We observe how in Matthew Jesus' prohibition of divorce is modified by the case of adultery. Where such accommodation has not taken place, we stand on that same ground of a quite unworldly Christianity in which the paradigmata grew up. But this means that we stand in a situation in which there were still many eyewitnesses of the life of Jesus who could correct the tradition when it was in error; only let us not think of error in the modern sense, as equivalent to inaccuracy in an affidavit. It is here that we have the best assurance for the general credibility of these portions of the tradition. It is relatively unimportant in which of the gospels they are found, so long as they bear the marks of that primitive mode of transmission.

As contrasted with these, the novellen stand on a rather lower level in respect of credibility, for the marks of the world are all too clearly stamped upon them; we cannot exclude the possibility that the other mode of narration has influenced substance as well as form. The further possibility is not to be excluded that in some cases alien matter has intruded and been attributed to Jesus. Of course, detailed investigation of the material can alone decide in such cases, and inquiry of this nature has not as yet gone very far. But some defining considerations can even now, as I think, be advanced; for even in the case of the novellen we can easily establish the general nature of the tradition.

The first point to notice is that in the tradition of the story of Jesus very few sections are found to have a spiritual content remote from the gospel which Jesus preached: to put it in another way, the whole tradition has a relative unity of spirit. Here and there, as in the case of the Gerasene demoniac or the coin found in the fish's mouth, an alien spirit is revealed, but the non-christian conceptions which the investigator may detect at these points are elsewhere found but seldom in the novellen.

Next, even in the novellen we do not find the typically legen-

dary interest in minor characters. Something of the sort perhaps makes itself felt in Matthew's narratives of Pilate's wife and of the death of Judas. But only on the outer circle of the narrative does this occur; even what we are told of Peter and the sons of Zebedee is relatively little, compared with the detailed knowledge about the disciples which later narrators imagined themselves to possess. And this comparison with later developments suggests a third point of importance. The gospels show practically no trace of the motive of miraculous self-help, of that device, so common in all cycles of legend, by which the saint or wonderworker is delivered by divine aid or by his own magical powers from an impasse into which his own or someone else's fault has brought him. Christian apocrypha, and especially the infancy-narrative of Thomas and the apocryphal Acts, are full of this sort of thing. According to pseudo-Thomas, one of Jesus' playfellows falls off a roof, and Jesus is accused of causing the accident; Jesus at once raises the boy to life, so that the boy is able to establish Jesus' innocence. Everyone knows how in the apocryphal Acts the apostles are essentially wonder-workers, who effect healings in the amphitheatre or compete with others in miraculous activity. The germs of this development are found even in the canonical Acts; for instance, in ch. xix, in the mention of the handkerchiefs and aprons which cured the sick, and in the miraculous escape, or self-deliverance, of the prisoners at Jerusalem and Philippi. But scarcely anything of the sort can be found in the canonical gospels. The coin in the fish's mouth, the alien character of which we have already referred to, is the only instance; miraculous self-help and miracle for miracle's sake are foreign to the Synoptic tradition. Jesus sends away the Jews who ask for a sign; at the crucifixion the cry is heard, "he saved others, himself he cannot save"; lastly, and perhaps most notably, the devil, who would fain persuade Jesus to do miracles for selfish reasons, is met with a refusal. The evangelists have not lost the impression that such miracle is unchristian. Even with the later and relatively less trustworthy elements of the gospel tradition in mind, we may say that the reckless admission of alien matter and the composition of legen-

dary stories like those developed later has as yet no place in it, or almost none.

One brief observation may serve to illustrate this. Interest in the personal appearance of the hero is a common mark of the legendary style. In the apocryphal Acts, as is well known, we have a description of Paul, the appearance of Thomas is depicted, and as for the Apostle John, a portrait of him is painted, and its success as a likeness is verified by the aid of a mirror. In the Acts of John we are told that Jesus appeared in differing forms, each of which is described. One remembers, too, the mediaeval Letter of Lentulus, with its description of the face and features of Jesus. No trace of this interest can be discovered in our gospels. This fact — everyone knows it and Christendom has long been reconciled to it by custom — that we possess neither picture nor description of our Lord, deserves a moment's consideration in connection with the points I have just suggested. It corresponds to the circumstance that in the gospels we possess traditions of varying value indeed, but a tradition which had not yet been spoiled by retouching, nor modified in style and substance by contact with the world.

IV

Lastly, let me say a word about the question of style in the Fourth Gospel. I have already said that there we are on different ground from that of the Synoptists, since the Fourth Evangelist is a far more independent workman than they. But it is undeniable that many of the characteristics which I assigned to the novellen may certainly be detected in the narratives of this gospel. The explanation, I take it, is obvious. The evangelist, his interests being of a wholly different order, did not create the miracle-stories which he includes — the miracle of Cana, of the pool of Bethesda, of the man born blind, or of Lazarus. Clearly he made use of traditions which his book alone preserves; and these traditions belonged in essence to the type of novellen; nor, in view of the late date of the gospel, is this to be wondered at. Hence, then, comes the description of the wonder-working pool; hence the details of the amazing

effect wrought on the man born blind, whom the neighbors failed to recognize; hence, most striking and most secular of all, the effect of the miracle at Cana, where the goodness of the wine is only disclosed by the jesting words of the ruler of the feast. None of this comes from John; it is traditional.

But the evangelist has thrown upon it all a peculiar illumination, lending significance to miraculous occurrences, after his manner, by means of parentheses and appended dialogues. The particular miracle related by the novelle is treated as the occasion through which the saving power, imparted continually by the exalted Lord to the believer, is at a given moment made visible to human eyes. Lazarus is raised; yet this is not only an isolated miracle — it is the momentary presentation of the experience, proper to all Christians, that Jesus is the resurrection and the life. The multitude is fed, as in the other gospels; but for John this is linked with the thought that Jesus, the Bread of Life, is forever feeding his own, in giving them what the gospel knows as 'life.' These thoughts are of course not derived from the tradition taken over by the evangelist, but they are his own spiritual possession; or rather, they spring from the inner experience of a man for whom it was a greater thing to have communion with Jesus in the spirit than to have had association with him during his earthly life. This view of the gospel and its interests holds good, I take it, independently of any question of authorship; for even the supposition that the evangelist was an eyewitness could not diminish the certainty that he means to give a presentation of the energies of the exalted Lord. And from this view we arrive, without straining the evidence, at a solution of the problem presented by the interweaving of primitive depiction of miracle and inspired interpretation in this gospel. The attempt has been made to solve that problem on the hypothesis of a redaction by a later hand. My own suggestion is simpler, as I think; this interweaving was the author's own redaction of a novelistic tradition.

The method which I have described takes account of our ability to distinguish between one style and another. But

to regard it as a process of aesthetic valuation would be to misunderstand it. My fellow-workers and I are not concerned with aesthetic appreciation, but with the understanding of the process which led to the production of the gospels. The particulars of all that I have propounded are of course subject to scientific discussion, in Germany as elsewhere: ⁴ it is the general method of approach, rather than the detailed results, that I desire to advocate. What we have to do is to interpret the gospels on the basis of the life and interests of the first Christian communities; not to import our problems into them prematurely, not even the problem of historicity. We have to read them in accordance with their original purpose, that is, to understand each section of the tradition from its relation to preaching and missionary work, or again from the delight of the churches in narration, and their incipient accommodation to secular ways.

I think I have shown that even the historical questions begin to solve themselves on this basis. But there is also a real gain for the understanding of the texts in learning better and better to hear from them the message which they had for their own generation, rather than the solution of questions which we ourselves should wish to put. We come then to discern, quite indirectly, that when thus understood they have more to say, even to us, than when we thrust our questions upon them. Thus the old rule of exegesis, ⁵ appended as a motto to that version of the New Testament which is most widely used in Germany, proves its value:

Te totum applica ad textum, rem totam applica ad te.

⁴ Cf. Erich Fascher, *Die formgeschichtliche Methode*, Giessen, 1924.

⁵ J. A. Bengel, *Novum Testamentum Graecum manuale*, 1734.

TRACES OF THAUMATURGIC TECHNIQUE IN THE MIRACLES

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

It has long been known that familiar features of the ordinary wonder-worker's manner of operation can be detected here and there in the stories of the miracles of Jesus. Nothing is more natural. Miracle stories had been current in the ancient world for centuries before the Christian era, and their number did not lessen thereafter. A type of popular story was developed, varying as to time and scene and as to the persons concerned in the action, but in spite of those variations carrying certain marks which, through their frequent recurrence, came to be expected as a matter of course. For example, the narrator makes much of the difficulty of the miracle and of the thoroughness of its success; and he shows a vivid interest in the behavior of the miracle-worker, carefully noting the various acts and gestures by which the wonder is brought to pass. What the hearer has learned to expect, the teller will not fail to provide; and it would be strange if the recorders of the life and works of Jesus had not woven into the accounts of his miracles some bits of conventional thaumaturgic technique. For obvious reasons the recognition of these has gone on slowly. It is the purpose of this paper to point out a few cases which appear to have escaped notice, or at least not to have been fully explained.

When the deaf and dumb man is brought to be healed by the laying on of the hand (Mark 7, 32 ff.), Jesus takes him aside from the throng, puts his fingers into the man's ears, spits and touches his tongue, looks upward, sighs (or groans), and says to him, "Ephphatha, that is, Be opened"; and the healing follows. In verse 34 the words are ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐστέναξεν κτλ. (ἀνεστέναξεν is a variant of 'Western' and Ferrar-group manuscripts). In Mark 8, 12 the Pharisees have tried to tempt Jesus by asking him for a sign from heaven; καὶ ἀναστε-

νάξας (v. l. στενάξας) τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει· Τί ἢ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον κτλ. Here, in place of the performance of a miracle we have the refusal to perform one. In the one case the unfortunate is cured, in the other a trap set by cunning enemies is avoided by a brief answer. If in the second case the sigh is prompted by sorrow or disgust at the baseness of the Pharisees, no such reason can explain the action in the case of the deaf man.

It is hardly necessary to review the efforts which commentators have made to explain these passages by reconstructing the emotions of Jesus. A better and more direct solution of the problem is suggested by the observation that στενάζω and ἀναστενάζω are words which have mystical and magical associations, and that the action denoted by them may be considered as a conventional feature of the wonder-worker's behavior.

The great Paris magical papyrus (suppl. gr. 574) contains, beginning with line 2441, an ἀγωγή, or charm, to bring a distant person into the presence of the operator. The virtues of the charm are described; then follows a receipt for making an incense to be used in connection with it; then directions about the time and place for using it, and a λόγος to be recited. At the end (lines 2492 ff.) there is the direction ταῦτα εἰπὼν θύσον καὶ ἀναστενάξας ἀναποδίζων κατὰβηθι, καὶ παραχρῆμα ἐλεύσεται, 'after reciting this throw incense on the fire, sigh, and descend, going backwards' (namely, from the roof of a house, where the charm is to be worked).

Richard Wünsch edited this part of the Paris papyrus in his "Aus einem griechischen Zauberpapyrus" (Bonn, 1911). On the word ἀναστενάξας he has this note: "Wohl nur 'ausstossen eines lauten rufes.' Das macht die gottheit aufmerksam und zieht sie herbei, A. Dieterich, Eine Mithrasliturgie², 41." In the passage which Wünsch cites, Dieterich does indeed show that loud cries, roarings, and bellowings were a part of the mystical-magical technique; and in the magical papyrus 121 of the British Museum (lines 765 ff.) there is a list of such inarticulate sounds in which στεναγμός occurs between ποππυσμός and συρισμός (sic). These last two actions, smacking the lips and hissing, are not infrequently prescribed in connection with

charms and incantations. For the whole question of the use of such inarticulate sounds in magic, see Th. Hopfner, "Griechisch-Aegyptischer Offenbarungszauber," Bd. I, § 780 (Vol. XXI of Wessely's Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde).

On the other hand, there is reason to believe that magicians sometimes imputed to the act of sighing a virtue which went beyond the mere sound produced. The Leyden Papyrus W (col. 21, lines 29 ff.) contains directions for an invocation accompanied by utterance of the mystic vowels, as follows: πνεῦσον ἔξω, ἔσω διαπλήρωσον εἰ οἰ οαι, ἔσω προσβαλόμενος μύκησαι ὀλολυγμούς· Δεῦρό μοι θεῶν θεέ, αῶ ηι ιαω αε οἰ ωτκ (sic), ἔλκυσαι ἔσω, πληροῦ καμῦων, μύκησαι ὅσον δύνασαι, ἔπειτα στενάξας συριγμῶ ἀνταπόδος. The last words must mean, 'then inhaling deeply give out the breath again with a hissing sound.' A kind of ritual of inhalation and exhalation is not unknown in mystical practice at various times and places.¹

More to the point, however, are some illustrations from the same Paris papyrus which furnished the instance of ἀναστενάξας cited above. Thus in line 537 (to be found also in Dieterich, Mithrasliturgie, p. 6) ἔλκε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκτίνων πνεῦμα τρις ἀνασπῶν ὁ δύνασαι καὶ ὅψει σεαυτὸν ἀνακουφιζόμενον καὶ ὑπερβαίνοντα ὥστε σε δοκεῖν μέσον τοῦ ἀέρος εἶναι, and in 628 ff. στὰς οὖν εὐθέως ἔλκε ἀπὸ τοῦ θείου ἀπενίζων εἰς σεαυτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα (Dieterich, p. 10). In both cases the mystic acquires power with the breath inhaled; and it is very likely that this idea is present in Mark 7, 34, and perhaps also in Mark 8, 12, although in the latter passage no miracle is worked.

The bearing of these last two passages upon the interpretation of Mark 7, 34, was rightly perceived by Martin Dibelius (Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, p. 47), who comments upon the passage as follows:

Die Erwähnung dieses Seufzers zwischen den beiden Motiven des Kraft heischenden und Kraft herabziehenden Blickes und der Formel "ephata" macht es mir zur Gewissheit dass auch dieser Seufzer ein Mittel der Heilung ist. Ich denke dabei an Rezepte wie die in Dieterichs sogenannter "Mithrasliturgie" S. 6, 4 zum Aufsteigen in den Himmel und zur Gottesschau

¹ M. Dibelius in the passage cited below mentions an instance in the practice of the Greek church.

gegebene Anweisung; "hole von den Strahlen Atem, dreimal einziehend so stark du kannst," oder S. 10, 23 "ziehe von dem Göttlichen gerade hinblickend in dich den Geisthauch." Blick und starkes Atemholen — unter Menschen Seufzer genannt — gehören zusammen als Mittel der Krafteinholung.

This view of Dibelius is mentioned with approval by Klostermann in his commentary on Mark in Lietzmann's *Handbuch*. It will be observed, however, that Dibelius did not have at command the evidence which marks στενάζειν itself as something of a *vox mystica*.

We may conclude then that in Mark 7, 34, and probably also in 8, 12, στενάζω and ἀναστενάζω would have suggested to the contemporary reader a well-known feature of the behavior of wonder-workers. These verbs may be rendered 'sigh' or 'groan,' according as the translator chooses to emphasize the one or the other of the two aspects of the action. Deep inhalation would be regarded as an act of preparation by the prophet or wonder-worker before making an authoritative utterance or an exertion of miraculous power; the inarticulate sound produced would be interpreted as evidence of possession by a spirit.

A similar problem presents itself in connection with the word ἐμβριμάομαι; for here also it is not easy to account for the emotion which the word has been supposed to denote in certain of the passages of the New Testament where it occurs. For a proper approach to the subject a brief lexicographical examination of this and related words is necessary. I disregard throughout such orthographic variations as βριμάομαι βριμόομαι.

It is likely that the earliest occurrence of any of the words in question is to be found in Aeschylus, *Seven against Thebes* 461 f.,

ἵππους δ' ἐν ἀμπυκτῆρσιν ἐμβριμωμένας
δινεῖ θελούσας πρὸς πύλαις πεπτωκέναι.

Liddell and Scott render the participle 'snorting.' Tucker, in his note on the passage, rightly says "not 'snorting' but 'chafing,' *indignantes* (schol. θυμοῦ πλήρεις)." The picture is that of scarce-controlled animal fury. The fact that the snorting of the mares is vividly, though grandiloquently, described in the two lines immediately following does not determine its meaning in line 461. 'Rage,' 'chafe,' 'fume' would suit Ar.

Eq. 855 εἰ σὺ βριμήσαιο. In Xen. Cyr. iv. 5, 9, ἐβριμούτο τῷ Κύρῳ the addition of the personal dative leads to a slight transfer of the meaning — ‘rage,’ ‘be infuriated’ ‘storm at,’ ‘scold,’ ‘be very angry at.’ This transferred meaning is to be found in the story of the woman who anointed the head of Jesus with the precious ointment (Mark 14, 4 f.): ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς αὐτούς . . . καὶ ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῇ. Here ἀγανακτοῦντες expresses the inward emotion of indignation, while ἐνεβριμῶντο has to do with its outward expression. It will be seen that derivatives of the stem βριμ- usually connote a vigorous expression of emotion, sometimes accompanied by sounds or words.

In verse 10 of the twenty-eighth Homeric Hymn, a poem which can scarcely be earlier than the fifth century before Christ, the word βρίμη occurs as an attribute of Athena. Here it is sometimes rendered ‘might,’ but it should be ‘martial fury,’ as the context clearly shows. Apollonius of Rhodes (iv. 1676) says of Talos, who has been destroyed by the magical arts of Medea, ὑπέειξε δαμῆναι Μηδείης βρίμη πολυφαρμάκου. Here again it is ‘fury’ rather than ‘might,’ and there is a further suggestion of frenzy in the word; for some lines above, in a passage which describes Medea’s actions, we find the typical procedure of the magician — invocation of evil spirits, charms and prayers thrice repeated, the casting of the evil eye, gnashing of the teeth in fury. There is a similar use of the participle ἐμβριμούμενοι in the Byzantine historian Menander (Corpus Scriptorum Hist. Byz. XIV, p. 381). This passage, which is interesting enough to be quoted, describes a strange ceremony by which the ambassadors of the Roman Empire were purified — themselves and their belongings — before they could be conducted into the presence of the Turkish Khan.

εἶτα τοῖς τοῦ λιβάνου κλάδοις πῦρ ἀνάψαντες τῇ Σκυθικῇ φωνῇ βάμβακα ἅττα ῥήματα ὑπεψιθύριζον ἐπιπαταγοῦντες δὲ κώδωνί τινα καὶ τυμπάνῳ ὑπερθεν τοῦ φόρτου περιέφερον τὸ φυλλῶδες τοῦ λιβάνου τῇ φλογὶ λακίζόμενον, καὶ ἅμα γινόμενοι μανιώδεις καὶ ἐμβριμούμενοι τὰ πονηρὰ ἀπελαύνειν ἐδόκουν· οὕτω γὰρ ἀποτρόπαιοί τινες εἶναι καὶ ἀλεξίκακοι ἐδόκουν. ἀποδιοπομπησάμενοι δὴ οὖν, ὥς ᾤοντο, τὰ δυσχερῆ, Ζήμαρχόν τε αὐτὸν δι’ αὐτῆς παρήγαγον τῆς φλογός· ᾧδὲ τε ἔδοξαν καὶ σφᾶς ἀφαγνίζειν.

The words *γινόμενοιμανιώδεις καὶ ἐμβριμούμενοι*, 'becoming mad and raving,' vividly describe the frenzy of the shamans. I hold to this translation notwithstanding that Suidas cites these words of Menander immediately after the gloss *ἐμβριμάται μετὰ αὐστη-
ρότητος ἐπιτιμῶ*.

Before leaving our examination of these words it should be noted that the idea of uttered sound is sometimes clearly associated with them; so for example in Orph. Fragm. 79 (Kern),

βρίμας ταυρείους ἀφίεις χαροποῦ τε λέοντος

and Lucian, Menippus 20, *ἐνεβριμήσατο ἡ Βριμῶ καὶ ὑλάκτησεν ὁ Κέρβερος*. A scholium on Ar. Ran. 562 glosses *ἐμνκᾶτο* with *ἐπεβριμήσατο*; and according to an illustration quoted by Suidas *ἐμβριμάομαι* could be used even of the roaring noise made by mills in grinding.

To sum up, the group of words that we have been examining may be said to denote violent rage accompanied by visible or audible manifestations of emotion. The verbs *βριμάομαι* and *ἐμβριμάομαι* may be slightly weakened so as to suggest only strong indignation; but when used of the behavior of a prophet, magician, or wonder-worker, there is a strong presumption that they imply frenzy or raving.

In John 11, 33, in the account of the raising of Lazarus from the dead, when Jesus sees Mary and her visitors weeping, *ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν*. I venture to translate this, 'the Spirit set him in a frenzy and he threw himself into disorder.' The 'Western' variant *ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι ὡς ἐμβριμούμενος* may be somewhat more smoothly rendered, 'he was shaken by the Spirit as one in a frenzy.' In verse 38 *ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ* seems to mean 'in suppressed (or inward) frenzy.' The narrator doubtless considered such a manifestation of seizure by the Spirit as a natural preliminary to so portentous a miracle. Some such interpretation of this peculiar expression seems not only warranted by the history of the word, but also better than any of the attempts which have been made to explain it by the supposed emotions of Jesus towards the natural grief of the mourners (compare, for example, Bauer's comment on this passage in Lietzmann's *Handbuch*).

The usual English translations 'groaned in the spirit' (vs. 33) and 'groaning in himself' (vs. 38) can be accepted only if divested of modern emotional connotations and supplemented by such explanations as will bring out clearly the associations which belonged to the Greek words at the time when they were written. Even then, if one insists upon bringing out the idea of sound which sometimes belongs to ἐμβριμάσθαι and kindred words, 'roaring' is more accurate than 'groaning.' Further, the translation which I have advocated above has the advantage of suiting both the common text of verse 33 and the variant ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι ὡς ἐμβριμούμενος. I do not think that this holds true for either 'groan' or 'be angry.'

It may be worth while to note that for vs. 33 Nonnus in his metrical paraphrase of John has only πνεύματι πατρώῳ δεδονημένος ἴαχε φωνήν. ἴαχε φωνήν may represent no more than εἶπεν, since a direct question immediately follows. Does πνεύματι πατρώῳ δεδονημένος represent ταραχθεὶς τῷ πνεύματι only, as Janssen thinks (*Das Johannesevangelium nach der Paraphrase des Nonnus*), or was it sufficient to cover ἐμβριμούμενος also? The second alternative is brought within the bounds of possibility if the translation which I favor is the right one.

We should not leave the miracle of the raising of Lazarus without observing that the common word ταρασσώ has in vs. 33, as in some other places, a technical coloring. In the previously cited magical papyrus of Paris we read at the end of a charm (lines 620 ff.) ταῦτά σου εἰπόντος ἀκούσει βροντῆς καὶ κλόνου τοῦ περιέχοντος, ὁμοίως δὲ σεαυτὸν αἰσθήσει ταρασσόμενον. The agitation is evidently the result of the visitation of a demonic power. In the Delphic cult, according to Plutarch (*De defectu oraculorum*, p. 435C) it was customary to pour a libation upon the victim until it trembled all over. This was clearly a token of the presence of the mantic power; for if the animal did not tremble as expected the oracle failed to perform its function. οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ τὸ διασεῖσαι τὴν κεφαλὴν ὥσπερ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις θυσίαις, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι δεῖ τοῖς μέρεσι τὸν σάλον ὁμοῦ καὶ τὸν παλμὸν ἐγγενέσθαι μετὰ ψόφου τρομώδους· ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, τὸ μαντεῖον οὐ φασι χρηματίζειν οὐδ' εἰσάγουσι τὴν Πυθίαν. Are not Plutarch's words (ἀλλὰ πᾶσι δεῖ τοῖς μέρεσι . . . ψόφου τρομώδους) simply a detached,

philosophical description of a phenomenon, which, when it shows itself in a human being and a prophet, John describes by the words *ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν*?

A little later on in the same treatise (p. 438A-B) Plutarch explains how the mantic seizure may be over-agitating and dangerous (*παραφόρον καὶ οὐκ ἀκέραιον καὶ ταρακτικόν*), so that upon a recent occasion when the omens were inauspicious (the victim remaining long unmoved under the libation) the Pythia, who had entered the oracular chamber unwillingly *εὐθὺς περὶ τὰς πρώτας ἀποκρίσεις ἦν καταφανὴς τῇ τραχύτητι τῆς φωνῆς οὐκ ἀναφέρονσα δικὴν νεὼς ἐπειγομένης, ἀλάλου καὶ κακοῦ πνεύματος οὔσα πλήρης* τέλος δὲ παντάπασιν ἐκταραχθεῖσα καὶ μετὰ κραυγῆς φοβερᾶς φερομένη πρὸς τὴν ἔξοδον ἔρριψεν ἑαυτήν. In John 13, 21, ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν καὶ εἶπεν κτλ. we have a clear case of the phrenetic agitation of the prophet. Nor is it beside the mark to notice that in John 5, 2-7, *ταράσσω* is used to describe the troubling of the pool of Bethesda — a sign of the presence of healing power.

The evidence, then, seems convincing. *ἐνεβριμήσατο καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν* in John 11, 33, refers to the characteristic behavior of the wonder-worker, and verse 38 must also be viewed in this light.

This discussion should not be closed without a glance at a passage which has given much trouble to the commentators, Mark 1, 41-43.² Here, at the close of the miracle of the healing of the leper, we have the words (verse 43) *καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἶπης κτλ.* (text of Codex Vaticanus). If *ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ* has the meaning 'storm at,' 'scold,' or even 'be angry at,' the word seems strangely inappropriate to the context; while for the meaning 'charge strictly' or 'sternly,' which is adopted by the makers of the Authorized and the Revised Versions, there seems to be no satisfactory authority. The glosses in Hesychius (*ἐμβριμήσαι ἐπιτιμῆσαι, κελεύσαι, προστάξαι μετ' ἐξουσίας*) and Suidas (cited above) may represent only a makeshift interpretation of the present passage. It is true that after the healing

² Professor Lake's treatment of the passage in this REVIEW, Vol. XVI, p. 197, has been called to my attention, but I can not agree with his conclusions.

of the two blind men we have a similar sentence (Matt. 9, 30), *καὶ ἐνεβριμήθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· ὁράτε, μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω*. But, as Klostermann remarks in his commentary, this may be dependent on Mark 1, 43; if so, it does not help to elucidate that passage.

Verse 41 in Codex Vaticanus reads *καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι*. If, instead of appearing in vs. 43, *ἐμβριμησάμενος* were read here in the place of *σπλαγχνισθεὶς*, it could be reasonably explained as I have tried to explain it in John 11, 33; the word would depict the oncoming of the miracle-worker's inspiration. Now it is an interesting and, I think, a significant fact that the 'Western' tradition of the text almost certainly had *ἐμβριμησάμενος* here, and did not have it in connection with the dismissal of the leper. It is necessary to present the readings in some detail; and here I am greatly indebted to Professor Ropes for an analysis of the textual situation.

Codex B: (41) *καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ θέλω καθαρίσθητι* (42) *καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ ἐκαθερίσθη* (43) *καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν* (44) *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ κτλ.*

Codex W: (41) *ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἤψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων θέλω καθαρίσθητι* (42) *καὶ εὐθέως ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα* (44) *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ κτλ.*

Codex b: (41) *et extendens manum ei dixit volo mundare* (42) *et discessit ab eo lepra* (44) *et ait illi etc.*

Codex D: *καὶ ὀργισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤψατο αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ θέλω καθαρίσθητι* (42) *καὶ εὐθέως ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη* (43) *καὶ ἐνεβρισάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν* (44) *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ κτλ.*

Professor Ropes writes:

The 'Western' text of Mark 1, 41-43 seems to be well represented (with the important exception of one word) by Codex W, as is shown by the Old Latin b (Veronensis) and also by fragments of the whole structure found in a c d e f r. The minor variations in these mss and W can be neglected here.

The only important correction to be made in the text of Codex W is the substitution of *ἐμβριμησάμενος* for *σπλαγχνισθεὶς*. This is done on the authority of a d f r, which have *iratus*. That *ἐμβριμησάμενος* could be natu-

rally translated by *iratus* is proved by d in John 11, 33 and 38, and that this was the case in Mark 1, 41, is the essence of my theory.

Now as to Codex D:

(1) *ὀργισθεῖς* is a retranslation of *iratus* (d) which, as we have seen, was itself (by my theory) a translation of *ἐμβριμησάμενος*. This shows a characteristic trait of D, and causes no surprise.

(2) Verse 43 and *καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη* of vs. 42 are inserted in D by conflation from the non-western text. This also is a frequent phenomenon in D. That it has actually taken place here is shown (or at least made highly probable) by the use of *εὐθύς* (instead of the Bezan *εὐθέως*), which is often, perhaps always, in D an index of some tampering with the text.

(3) There are some minor differences between D and W, but they do not affect the substantial identity with W of the 'Western' text upon which D rests. It is quite possible that some or all of the differences are due to the conformation to the non-western text effected in D. Note that D agrees with W in the order *ἤψατο αὐτοῦ*. Most of the peculiarities of W are supported by other witnesses which contain 'Western' fragments.

The single correction of *σπλαχνισθεῖς* to *ἐμβριμησάμενος* in W being accepted, my conclusion would be that the 'Western' text of W, as thus corrected, is a characteristic rewriting of the text of B, in this instance producing, as often, a drastic abbreviation, but with an effort to retain what was noteworthy in the basic text. I should accept B as giving substantially the original text of the evangelist.

For my own part, approaching the passage not as a critic of the text — in which capacity I could not pretend to competency — but as a student of the ideas associated with *ἐμβριμάομαι*, I find it impossible not to favor the 'Western' text, which read *ἐμβριμησάμενος* in vs. 41, where its appropriateness can be defended, and omitted it from the dismissal of the leper, where only a very poor case can be made out for it.

It seems to me that the whole textual situation can be best explained by the assumption that *ἐμβριμησάμενος* is original in vs. 41. In that case *iratus* of the Old Latin ms. would be a translation of *ἐμβριμησάμενος*, not quite accurate, but natural enough for a man not familiar with its suggestion of prophetic frenzy. *ὀργισθεῖς* of Codex D could be viewed as a retranslation of *iratus*, as Ropes suggests, or it might be merely a gloss — a familiar word used in place of a less common one. When we find some 'Western' authorities (b among them) omitting altogether the first participle in vs. 41, that is, not translating *ἐμβριμησάμενος* at all, we may regard that as one way of "improving" a text which contained a word of doubtful propriety

in this context. Another way — substituting a word to which no objection could be raised — was taken by the non-western MSS with their *σπλαγχνισθείς*.

I agree with Ropes's opinion that vs. 43 is inserted in D by conflation from the non-western text. But is vs. 43 of the Vaticanus itself immune from suspicion? If *ἐμβριμησάμενος* means simply *iratus*, the anger is scarcely in point; nor, on the other hand, is an access of prophetic frenzy to be expected after the miracle has been performed. I should think it most likely that *ἐμβριμησάμενος* has been brought into vs. 43 by some textual confusion. Could it, after being expelled from vs. 41, have found temporary lodgment in the margin, to insinuate itself later into vs. 43? Or — to mention a suggestion of Professor Sanders — does *ἐμβριμησάμενος* mark vs. 43 as a sort of doublet of the original (that is, to my thinking, the 'Western') form of vs. 41, conflated with a sentence describing the dismissal of the leper? For an example of a conflate reading in B see Professor Sanders's discussion of the Michigan Papyrus of Acts in the January number of this REVIEW, p. 17.

I am very conscious of the complicated character of the textual problem here, and of the danger of taking a one-sided view of it. But at least we should hesitate long, in view of the evidence adduced in this paper, before reconciling ourselves to accept *ἐμβριμησάμενος* in vs. 43 in a sense which suits neither the circumstances of the story nor the normal use of the word.

